



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/038,673	12/31/2001	Bhashyam Ramesh	10238	9052	
26890	7590 12/21/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
JAMES M. STOVER NCR CORPORATION			BETIT, JACOB F		
	I PATTERSON BLVD,	WHQ4	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON, O	OH 45479	•	2164		

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-,		A				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comme		10/038,673	RAMESH, BHASHYAM			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
<u></u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Jacob F. Betit	2164			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Externance after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 No	ovember 2005.				
		action is non-final.				
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-18,20-31,33-43 and 48-50</u> is/are	e pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) 🗌	6) Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-18,20-31,33-43 and 48-50</u> is/are rejected.					
7)						
8) 🗌	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	•		SAM RIMELL			
	:		PRIMARY EXAMINER			
Attachment	• • .					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	PTO-413) te			
3) 🔲 Inforn	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-43, and 48-50 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to U.S. patent No. 6,957,210 B1 to Ramesh and U.S. patent No. 6,957,222 to Ramesh. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-43, and 48-50 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,210 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are arguably broader than claim 1-42 of Ramesh '210 which encompasses the same metes, bounds, and limitations. Therefore, it would be obvious to eliminate the limitations of the narrower claims, since it has been held that omission of an

Art Unit: 2164

element and its function and a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions as before involves only routine skill in the art. See In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-43, and 48-50 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,222 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are arguably broader than claim 1-21 of Ramesh '222 which encompasses the same metes, bounds, and limitations. Therefore, it would be obvious to eliminate the limitations of the narrower claims, since it has been held that omission of an element and its function and a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions as before involves only routine skill in the art. See In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

jfb

14 Dec 2005

SAM RIMELL RIMARY EXAMINER